Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/435,748	BUCKLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark Ruthkosky	1745
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, P	ΓO personnel):	
(1) Mark Ruthkosky.	(3)	
(2) Mr. Peter Dardi.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 June 2004.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) applicant's representat	tive]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)∏ No.	
Claim(s) discussed:		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g)⊠ was not reached. h)□] N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the gene reached, or any other comments: Mr. Dardi and I discuss is not appealable. I explained that I would remove the othe same reasoning. I noted that the appeal brief could change to the office action, as compared with the final real (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the ame allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.	sed the appeal brief and that a bejection and include a new rejethen be resubmitted after the dejection, is the examiner's consendents which the examiner to copy of the amendments that	an objection to the specification ection to the same material with office action. The only other tact information.
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICI INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to given one month from this interview date, of FORM, whichever is later, to file a statement summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse	the last Office action has alrea DR THE MAILING DATE OF T IT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF	dy been filed, APPLICANT IS HIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY
	11.	:A 41 \1.
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's sign	gnature, if required